

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has not amended any claims. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 12-28 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 12-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen, *et al.* (US 7181202) in view of Houde (US 6032043) and further in view of Belski, *et al.* (US 6657552). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections and submits the following remarks for the Examiner's favorable reconsideration.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. **Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (MPEP 2143).** In that regard, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's two references still fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the presently pending independent claims.

Claim 12 recites:

12. A method for setting up a connection in a system for mobile telecommunications, wherein the following steps are performed by a first call control node:

receiving a call set-up request message comprising an indication of at least two services and an identification of a called party;

sending a routing information request message to a database for storing subscriber data, wherein the request comprises an identification of a first of the at least two services, an identification of the called party, and an indication that at least one further routing request message will be sent;

receiving a response message from the database;

determining that the response message comprises an indication that the database is adapted to process the indication that at least one further routing info request message will be sent;
sending a further routing information request message comprising an identification of a further service, and receiving a further response message;
analysing the received response messages; and,
sending or not in dependence of the result of the analysis a call set-up request message to a further call control node. (emphasis added)

In contrast to the Applicant's invention, Rasanen merely discloses communication between two mobile stations that utilize control nodes to perform the disclosed functions (see FIG. 1, Col. 6, lines 4-67). Unlike the Applicant's invention, Rasanen provides no mention at all of providing an indicator to a database storing subscriber data. The Applicant's invention provides a novel method to inform the database that a request is being made for more than one service during call set-up. The teachings of Rasanen not only do not specifically disclose a database, but do not disclose the functions claimed by Applicant. Additionally, Rasanen does not provide any discussion of these messages being sent to the database. Rather, Rasanen merely discloses a user to user perspective rather than any discussion or utilization of the database.

Houde is cited for disclosing a database for receiving service requests. However, Houde does not provide any teaching or suggestion of informing a database that a request is being made for more than one service during cal set-up.

The Examiner stated that Rasanen, as modified by Houde, does not show a message which indicates an indication of a further routing request message will be sent. The Applicant agrees. However, the Examiner further stated that Belski discloses an indication of a further request message being sent. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization. Belski merely discloses providing an indication that a single message is a multiple frame message (see col. 10, lines 25-45 of Belski). If the flag (indicator) is set to "0", no more frames are to follow. If the indicator is set to indicate that more frames are to be used, the lower 8 bits of the single message will be used. Thus, Belski does not teach or suggest sending an indicator that one more further routing message will be sent. Belski merely discloses an indication of expanded

use of frames in a single message. Furthermore, Belski provides no teaching or suggestion of utilizing more than one service during call set-up.

Thus, the combination of Rasanen, Houde and Belski fails to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 12. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest the step of sending a routing information request message to a database for storing subscriber data, wherein the request comprises an identification of a first of the at least two services, an identification of the called party, and an indication that at least one further routing request message will be sent. In addition, independent claims 14, 23, and 25 contain similar limitations which are also not taught or suggested by Rasanen, Houde, and Belski. Claims 13 and 16-22 depend from novel claim 12 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 12. Claim 15 depends from novel claim 14 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 14. Claim 24 depends from novel claim 23 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 23. Claims 26-28 depend from novel claim 25 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 25. Therefore, the allowance of claims 12-28 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roger S. Burleigh, Reg#40542/

Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: December 22, 2008

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com